

Fairfax County Pre-Disaster Recovery Planning (PDRP)

Steering Committee Meeting #5

February 2, 2011

Attendees:

Dave McKernan-OEM
Mike Ryan-OEM
Amanda Phan-OEM
Phil Webber- Witt & Assoc.
Hal Cohen- Witt & Assoc.
Lindsey Holman- Witt & Assoc.
Mark Barbieri- Department of Health
Carol Lamborn- Department of Public Works and Environmental Services
Ron Kirkpatrick- Department of Public Works and Environmental Services
Jim Stratoudakis- Community Services Board
Marilyn McHugh- County Attorney's Office
Sandra Chisholm- Neighborhood and Community Services
Brian Heffern – Department of Management & Budget
John Turner- Housing and Community Development
Leslie Johnson- Department of Planning and Zoning
Carl Varner- Disability Services Board
Phyllis Black- Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce

OEM Representative: Introduced herself and thanked the attendees for coming. She also initiated re-introductions. The Steering Committee then introduced themselves and their affiliation. Amanda then explained the current status of the PDRP project and if anyone would be opposed to moving the SC meetings to MPSTOC.

****The group agreed to have the meetings at MPSTOC.**

She also requested that if members cannot attend the meetings, to please send a liaison to take notes. She also provides a list of planned meetings including Equity Advocates, Stakeholder/Public Survey efforts. There have been updates to the PDRP webpage including meeting minutes, disaster recovery articles, and the response vs. recovery graphic. She also announced the Working Group Meeting to be held Feb. 9th, Supervisor McKay will be in attendance.

Witt Consultant: Introduced Phil Webber, Witt Associates, and provided further explanation of the Working Group meeting. Most of the discussion of today's meeting will be regarding Concept of Operations (CONOPS). During the discussion last meeting, it was suggested that several of the Recovery Functions (RF) should be broken up. We have tried to re organize them into additional categories. Does the group think that this reorganization will be better?

Steering Committee: Yes

Witt Consultant: Provided an explanation of the RF spreadsheet and how they will be organized according to Incident Command System (ICS). For organizational purposes, Public Safety will remain under the Health, Social, and Community Services. The PDRP Groups are designed to interface with the

National Disaster Recovery Framework (NDRF) structure while still providing for a smooth transition from response to recovery by correlating with the Fairfax Emergency Operations Plan (EOP).

The preliminary material of the CONOPS section was reviewed previously. Under new draft plan elements, the housing section was released to you last week. We will table that section for now to make sure we can devote enough time to the CONOPS. Increasingly, we will be in territory where there is no agency that does some of these functions, (i.e –long term housing).

OEM Representative: In the future, I plan to get someone from each agency listed as primary and support in the RF annexes to attend the meetings. There are several county agencies that are not represented in the core Steering Committee but still have a function and should be represented.

Witt Consultant: (CONOPS) We know that this is consistent with recovery best practices and ICS, but we want to be sure it works well at the agency level. Unlike response, during recovery the agencies will be doing agency work. Let's start with page 3-6, we will describe one of the ICS concepts, the planning cycle. We will explain that process here. Under county governing authorities, we are specifically describing the authorities of the county government and we will need the legal authorities of the implementation of the plan. We want to make clear that in a response situation the decision making authority is designated to an incident command level. During recovery we are working with an everyday governance structure. I want to make sure there are not emergency powers in effect for the facilitation of this plan.

Witt Consultant: I think the governance and the authority is the same. I'm not sure if we need to have a distinction between the governing authorities in the EOP and the PDRP. It should be the same.

OEM Representative: What about to make policies to make things move faster?

Witt Consultant: That is where the emergency ordinances would come in, but you wouldn't have a change in leadership. Their title may change but the overall governing authority doesn't shift from response to recovery.

OCA Representative: It would be interesting to see how similar plans address the authorities.

OEM Director: I don't think the authorities will change. My concern is the purchasing authorities. Our event maybe over, but the state and the Feds may still be under a declared event. Would that affect us?

Witt Consultant: Provided an explanation of the management structure under which the PDRP will be implemented. He assured the Steering Committee that the top level org structure will be reviewed and approved by the Board Of Supervisors (BOS) and County Exec. The Recovery Policy Group, there are a number of ways to set up this group; however there is no best practice. Some places use them to set policy or control funds. In general, they provide direction by including external stakeholders as members. Who would serve on this committee, their exact purpose, structure, and authority has yet to be determined.

OEM Director: The idea of the group is to provide transparency into the recovery process. How do you get that buy in from business, county exec, BOS, and the public? The Recovery Policy Group is way to accomplish public outreach as well.

Health Representative: I would think the BOS are representing the community interest; the policy group would kind of serve as the senior policy group for the county by advising the county exec.

Witt Consultant: The question is if the ICS type of policy group provides the same transparency and accountability to the public. Will the BOS want to serve that role or have a buffer? In both Iowa and LA they had a group like this. Pre-disaster recovery plans always have some sort of group like this. They always use that group as a mechanism to provide accountability, citizen and stakeholder input, transparency.

Health Representative: What about calling it the Community Advisory Group?

Inter-Faith Community Representative: If one person was appointed from each district, you would want those appointments to occur prior to the event so they are familiar with the process.

Witt Consultant: Well the people that you want on the board will vary depending on the disaster.

OEM Director: We need to be flexible with the criteria for appointments to allow for different disasters and situations.

Witt Consultant: Generally, the Recovery Support Function (RSF) Branches will consist of mostly county people, but the direction can come from the policy group

OEM Representative: Looking at this from ICS structure, this would be more of a liaison type of position. They will serve as an intermediate. They will get the feedback from the public and serve as a buffer to and from the public to the BOS. The liaison will serve as a conduit for feedback between the public and BOS. The group would serve as the common pathway so that there is familiarity built as a point for the public and the leadership.

DPWES Representative: One might want this group to take more of a leadership role and some not.

Witt Consultant: For the next meeting, we come back with some best practices and potential recommendations to discuss here. We will narrow it down and they give it to the BOS.

Management and Budget Representative: This will be a really big deal to the BOS.

Witt Consultant: Explained the organization within the Recovery Agency, which is a straight-up ICS structure. If you will look at the text pages 12-14 describes the Agency. The one pieces of interest for this group is where the Groups/Units actually are. The idea is that as the Groups are activated would be detailed to the Recovery agency, everyone under them would stay in their agency. I would like to get from you, whether this is workable. In terms of lines of authority, the people out there in the agencies, that would answer to the lead within the recovery framework.

Health Representative: Will there be an ICS Operations (Ops) lead that will pull those functions together?

Witt Consultant: To the degree the hierarchy is set up. This is designed to be set-up as needed. We want to leave flexibility so the organization can be set up as needed. Does that seem like a solution?

DPWES Representative: So you would have one person from the lead agencies assigned to these positions and they would tap other agencies for support as needed?

Management and Budget Representative: We kind of have that happening now.

OEM Director: Remember that this is scalable, when we say there maybe one person. DPWES, maybe staffing this full time, and public safety scaled back to ½ time. It would depend on the situation.

DPWES Representative: So you will be pulling your senior staff/your best.

OEM Representative: Have we listed any of the private / nonprofits (PNP) as lead or support agencies? We will need them to do this too. We will run into issue with that when we ask the public for their opinion? If we are going to try to incorporate the community resources, are we missing something by not asking other orgs to take the lead?

Witt Consultant: That would come from the Recovery Coordinator; there are functions where those types of organizations are listed. If the role of the public sector is to be the referee, then this type of structure doesn't seem out of line.

Inter-Faith Community Representative: I think that the way this is being developed, as long as the role of the PNP and the community is clearly defined, that will work. They are being involved in the process throughout the duration of development as well.

OEM Director: I think the liaison will play a huge part in this, they will take the players with a vested interest. As a government, we can't do this alone. We will certainly need that support from the community, and the liaison officer will be key to that.

Witt Consultant: I agree, with the last, the liaison could work as a conduit for community involvement. I'm looking at the org chart. If you look at the branch level, the transparency will be a bottom up approach. Planning will have to take place and visioning. We need to establish a process at the branch level for community involvement as well. I think there should be general statements on how the community will be engaged at the branch level.

Witt Consultant: On page 14-15 we give a description of the Recovery Functions. At the bottom of page 15, those are the functional branches. (He then provided a description of how the PIO will integrate into the org structure.) There would be a PIO and Liaison assigned to each branch. On the next series of pages, I want to go through noting the flexibility of the org structure.

Witt Consultant: Provided the group will a scenario to describe the graphic organizational structure. He provided examples of the Groups being activated as Task forces, Units, and Single Groups. He also provided an explanation of how the organization can expand and contract as needed throughout the recovery process.

Witt Consultant: On page 25, Recovery Sites and Facilities, we want to clarify that in current FFX and state plans there are a lot of different sites. This lays out two types of county sites and IDs the FEMA JFO and recommends that it is located/co-located with the County Recovery Center. On page 26-end, I want to talk through the transition from a response structure to the recovery structure. When reviewing this,

please consider whether this will actually work and what could potentially go wrong. He then provided an overview of how the organizational structure will transition from response to recovery.

OEM Director: I might actually make a for example, deputy of operations chief, who would then starting working on the recovery. You can do that all the way down, by making your deputies work on Recovery so that when you switch all the response section chiefs become deputies during recovery and vice versa.

Witt Consultant: It may also make it cleaner for the allocation of funds by establishing the Recovery type Agency.

Witt Consultant: I encourage you to go through the rest of the CONOPS including the section regarding Maintenance and Local Control. Item F, we will work with OEM to define a clear way of doing that. We list how the plan interacts with other plans. There are some regional plans that are being reformulated, that may be replaced by what we are doing here. We will update that as needed.

Witt Consultant: Please note if this fails to communicate clearly in a way that could be understood by the general public that would be interested.

Inter-Faith Community Representative: I do like the graphic of page 15. It clearly communicates what we will be doing and how it blends.

OCA Representative: I think we need to reflect that there isn't a Continuity of Governance (COG) plan yet in the PDRP.

Witt Consultant: That is a major concern; this plan without a COG plan isn't functional. We need to discuss how to get that ball rolling.

OEM Representative: Let have the turnaround for review in 3 weeks. If anyone has issues with the timeline, let me know.

OEM Director: If any of you need help explaining this, please contact us.

OEM Representative: If there is anyone you are sending this to that wants to know more, suggest they attend the Feb. 9th meeting. The next SC meeting will be March 2nd. We will go over material for Housing and Long-term recovery as well as continue CONOPS.